

Applicant : Terence S. Dowling, et al.
Serial No. : 09/378,227
Filed : August 19, 1999
Page : 12

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-322001 / P296

REMARKS

Claims 1-63 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3, 17, 46 and 49 are amended. Claims 52-63 have been added. A marked up version of the changes made by the current amendment is attached. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is respectfully requested in view of these amendments and the following remarks.

1. Response to Rejections under Section 102

Claims 1, 2, 11, 17, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,563,725 to Kumada et al. ("Kumada"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

a. Claim 1, 2, and 11

As amended, claim 1 recites a method for use in a display system operable to display each of a plurality of pixels at a visual output intensity relative to an output display device according to a corresponding pixel input value. The method comprises determining a set of device specific pixel input values, based on user input, that will cause the display system to display a corresponding set of target visual output intensities relative to the output display device. The determining step includes displaying a control region on the output display device, and adjusting a common pixel input value for the control pixels defining the control region until the target visual output intensities are achieved.

Kumada neither discloses nor suggests displaying a control region on the output display device, and adjusting common pixel input values for the control pixels defining the control region until the target visual output intensities are achieved. Kumada discloses obtaining monitor model information from a monitor controller (column 10, line 19), and using the monitor model information to output the chromatic characteristic information of the monitor to the printer controller for the execution of the color correction process (column 13, lines 39-41). In Kumada, the host executes a process to fetch a monitor ID sequence representing a model of a monitor connected to a monitor controller (column 13, lines 9-10). The monitor ID sequences are used to

Applicant : Terence S. Dowling, et al.
Serial No. : 09/378,227
Filed : August 19, 1999
Page : 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-322001 / P296

obtain color correction coefficients for the monitor (column 13, lines 24-34). The monitor ID sequence is input to the monitor controller using a dip switch (column 10, lines 60-62).

The Applicant respectfully submits that Kumada neither discloses nor suggests displaying a control region, and adjusting the common pixel input value for control pixels defining the control region until the target visual output intensities are achieved. Claim 1 is therefore allowable over Kumada. Claims 2 and 11 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

b. Claim 17, and 18

As amended, claim 17 recites a method for determining device-specific information for pixels to obtain an optimal display of fine structure monochrome images on an output display device. The method includes displaying a plurality of regions in a display device, the displaying step including selecting a pattern for each region of the plurality of regions. The method also includes determining a device-specific sub-pixel geometry for all pixels of the output display device, based on user input selecting a region of the plurality of regions, where each pixel includes a plurality of sub-pixels each defining a color component and a sub-pixel position associated with a given pixel.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kumada does not disclose or suggest a method of determining a device-specific sub-pixel geometry for all pixels of the output display device. In addition, Kumada neither discloses nor suggests the use of user input in the form of selecting a region of the plurality of regions displayed on the output display device to determine the sub-pixel geometry of the output display device. Claim 17 is therefore allowable over Kumada. In addition, Applicant submits that claim 17 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above in the context of claim 1. Claim 18 depends from claim 17 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reason.

2. Response to Rejections under Section 103

Claims 42-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumada in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,278,434 to Hill et al. (Hill).

a. Claims 42-45

Applicant : Terence S. Dowling, et al.
Serial No. : 09/378,227
Filed : August 19, 1999
Page : 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-322001 / P296

Claims 42-45 depend directly from claim 17, and therefore include all the limitations of that claim. Applicant submits that these claims are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above in the context of claim 17.

b. Claims 46-48

As amended claim 46 recites a method for use in a display system operable to display each of a plurality of pixels at a visual output intensity relative to a liquid crystal display (LCD) device according to a corresponding pixel input value. The method determines device-specific information for pixels to obtain an optimal display of fine structure monochrome images on a liquid crystal display (LCD) device. The method comprises determining a set of device specific pixel input values, based on user input, that will cause the display system to display a corresponding set of target visual output intensities relative to the liquid crystal display (LCD) device. The determining step includes displaying a control region on the liquid crystal display (LCD) device, and adjusting a common pixel input value for the control pixels defining the control region until the target visual output intensities are achieved.

Hall discloses a method of displaying an image at an increased resolution by treating the sub-pixel components independently. Kumada and Hall do not disclose or suggest displaying a control region on the display device, and adjusting a common pixel input value for the control pixels defining the control region until the target visual output intensities are achieved. Because Kumada and Hall, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least these limitations of claim 46, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established, and claim 46 is allowable. Claims 47 and 48 depend directly or indirectly from claim 46 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

c. Claim 49-51

As amended, claim 49 recites a method for use in a display system operable to display a plurality of pixels. The method determines device-specific information for pixels to obtain an optimal display of fine structure monochrome images on a liquid crystal display (LCD) device. The method displays a plurality of regions on the liquid crystal display (LCD) device, the displaying step including selecting a pattern for each region of the plurality of regions. The method includes determining a device-specific sub-pixel geometry for all pixels of the liquid crystal display (LCD) device, based on user input, where each pixel includes a plurality of

Applicant : Terence S. Dowling, et al.
Serial No. : 09/378,227
Filed : August 19, 1999
Page : 15

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-322001 / P296

sub-pixels each defining a color component and a sub-pixel position associated with a given pixel.

Kumada and Hall do not disclose displaying a plurality of regions on the output display device. In addition Kumada and Hall do not disclose or suggest the use of user input in determining a device-specific sub-pixel geometry for all pixels of the liquid crystal display (LCD) device where each pixel includes a plurality of sub-pixels each defining a color component and a sub-pixel position associated with a given pixel. Because Kumada and Hall, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least these limitations of claim 49, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established, and claim 49 is allowable. Claims 50 and 51 depend directly or indirectly from claim 49 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

3. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for indicating that Claims 3-10, 12-16, 19-41 were merely objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, and otherwise were in allowable form. Claim 3 has been amended. The Applicant believes that the Examiner's objections are rendered moot in view of these amendments.